



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,847	12/19/2001	Richard D. Kreckel	SBC 0108 PA	6132

7590

07/21/2004

Robert P. Renke
Suite 250
28333 Telegraph Road
Southfield, MI 48034

EXAMINER

TAYLOR, BARRY W

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2643	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,847

Applicant(s)

KRECKEL ET AL.

Examiner

Barry W Taylor

Art Unit

2643

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: A method according to "claim 5". The Examiner notes that Applicant's have cancelled claim 5. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-15 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of Janning (6,052,448).

Regarding claims 1 and 12. Walter teaches a system and method of processing a plurality of call detail records (CDRs) each indicative of a call transaction on a telecommunication network (see all especially col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25) comprising:

receiving a plurality of CDRs at a first controller, each of the CDRs having a data structure including a plurality of fields containing at least one character (col. 2 lines 41-42, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

selecting a first sorting field from the plurality of fields and grouping the plurality of CDRs as a function of data within the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 44-47, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25);

analyzing a second sorting field within each of the CDRs within a group of CDRs sorted by the first sorting field (col. 2 lines 47-49, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25); and

generating a report for each of the grouped CDRs as a function of data within the second sorting field (col. 2 lines 49-52, col. 12 line 25 – col. 14 line 25).

According to Applicant (see paper number 4, Amendment "A", dated 6/02/2004, last four lines on page 7 and second to last paragraph on page 8), Walter first groups according to time stamp verses Applicant's amended independent claim language of first grouping according to carrier identification field. The Examiner notes that sorting by time then by carrier as evident by Walter verses sorting by carrier then by time (see

Applicant's amended independent claims 1 and 12) is a matter of design choice and is not novel to one of ordinary skill in the art of filtering call detail records.

For the sake of argument, Janning teaches method for flexible formatting of call detail records that reduces storage and processing requirements wherein CDR types are classified as "must-have" or "don't care" and selecting template which includes all of the must-have call details (abstract). In other words, Janning discloses arranging raw information into CDR template having plurality of fields (col. 6 line 30 – col. 15 line 28) which are selected freely (col. 2 lines 28-45). Janning list the plurality of fields that may be selected for template which include: billing type, call type, carrier identification, disconnect type, etc (see TABLE I starting on column 6 line 30).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the invention as taught by Walter to use the flexible format as taught by Janning for the benefit of selecting only "must-have" fields to be included in CDRs as taught by Janning.

Regarding claim 2. Walter teaches the plurality of CDRs are generated at a second controller (see 10 figure 1) remotely located from the first controller (see 16 figure 1) coupled to the telecommunication network.

Regarding claim 3. Walter teaches at least one of the plurality of fields includes a plurality of subfields (col. 3 lines 46-66).

Regarding claim 17. Walter teaches the first sorting field is a carrier identification field (see col. 4 lines 14-22).

Regarding claims 6 and 18-19. Walter teaches the second sorting field in an enhanced service (see col. 4 lines 23-25 wherein second sort field corresponds to call service and destination metric).

Regarding claims 8-10. Walter teaches using third sorting field (see CDR ANALYSIS section starting on column 5 line 35 wherein data indicative of call attempts).

Regarding claim 11. Walter teaches the report is a Trunk report (col. 1 lines 34-48, col. 3 lines 46-57, col. 4 lines 45-67, col. 5 lines 11-35).

Regarding claim 13. Walter shows plurality of servers (see plurality of servers 18 figure 1).

Regarding claim 14. Walter shows plurality of remotely located clusters (see figure 1 wherein remote clusters 18 are remote from server 10).

Regarding claim 15. Walter shows master database (see 10 figure 1) in operative communication with each of the plurality of remotely located clusters (18 figure 1), the master database for storing each of the plurality of CDRs generated by each of the clusters.

3. Claims 4, 16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view of in view of Janning (6,052,448) further in view of Burke et al (6,356,628 hereinafter Burke).

Regarding claims 4, 16 and 20. Walter in view of Janning does not explicitly show the call transaction is a long distance calling card transaction. However, Walter discloses that other fields may be included (col. 3 line 57).

Burke teaches a method for examining long distance carrier phone bill wherein CDRs are examined (see step 22 figure 2) to filter out calling card calls (see calling card call (i.e. record number 10 listed in TABLE 1) is filtered out of the call detail records).

It would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system and method as taught by Walter in view of Janning to include filter as taught by Burke for the benefit of further sorting CDRs according to calling card type calls.

4. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walter (5,999,604) in view Janning (6,052,448) further in view of Rail et al (5,680,611 hereinafter Rail).

Regarding claim 7. Walter in view of Janning does not explicitly show receiving CDRs at daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, or yearly intervals.

Rail teaches CDRs received and stored within specified data range. For example, the date range maybe by month, week, day or other range (col. 4 lines 23-33).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for any one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the invention as taught by Walter in view of Janning to use date range as taught by Rail for the benefit of further grouping CDRs according to current month (see 30a in figure 1 of Rail) or previous months (see numbers 30b to 30d in figure 1 of Rail).

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 2643

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 12 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barry W Taylor whose telephone number is (703) 305-4811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to Technology Center 2600 customer service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.


CURTIS KUNTZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600